

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 28

OCTOBER 16, 1972 TO OCTOBER 18, 1972

(PAGES 36625 TO 37760)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the conference report which I bring back to the Senate will not satisfy all Members of the Senate—few, if any, do—because a true conference requires give and take by both sides.

The conference report provides an overall annual rate of new fiscal year 1973 obligational authority of \$3,652,701,000.

Recalling that the annual rate in the joint resolution which passed the Senate yesterday totaled \$3,494,701,000, it can be said that in conference the annual rate, as proposed by the House, was reduced by \$357,454,000, while the Senate figure was increased by only \$158 million.

It is, of course, important to understand the specific appropriation accounts in which the annual rates were increased over the figure that passed the Senate yesterday. These are as follows:

American Schools and Hospitals	
Abroad	+ \$5, 500, 000
Development Loans	+50, 000, 000
Military Assistance	+50, 000, 000
Regional Naval Training	+2, 500, 000
Security Supporting Assistance ..	+50, 000, 000

It is also perhaps deserving of note that the annual rate in the continuing resolution, as reported by the conference committee is \$1,510,323,000 under the budget estimates submitted by the President and considered by both Houses.

The continuing resolution as passed by the House included \$42.5 million to fund International Narcotic Control programs authorized by section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act. The resolution as passed by the Senate contained no such appropriation. The conference committee report includes no separate line item appropriation for narcotic control programs.

I would like to emphasize it was the intent of the conferees to permit narcotic control programs under section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act to be funded as they have been in past years, from any funds appropriated for foreign assistance purposes including supporting assistance, technical assistance, or other funds. It was not the intent of the conference to prevent the expenditure of funds appropriated under the continuing resolution for narcotic control purposes.

I expect to solidly support full funding of the President's request for this item in the annual bill and do not believe that there is any question that the full amount will be allowed.

I believe that most of those who served as conferees will agree that this represents our best efforts. I urge the Senate to accept it as the best possible means of resolving this difficult issue in the waning hours of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield to receive a message from the President of the United States?

Mr. INOUE. I yield.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972—VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate of the United States:

The pollution of our rivers, lakes and streams degrades the quality of American life. Cleaning up the Nation's waterways is a matter of urgent concern to me, as evidenced by the nearly tenfold increase in my budget for this purpose during the past four years.

I am also concerned, however, that we attack pollution in a way that does not ignore other very real threats to the quality of life, such as spiraling prices and increasingly onerous taxes. Legislation which would continue our efforts to raise water quality, but which would do so through extreme and needless overspending, does not serve the public interest. There is a much better way to get this job done.

For this reason, I am compelled to withhold my approval from S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972—a bill whose laudable intent is outweighed by its unconscionable \$24 billion price tag. My proposed legislation, as reflected in my budget, provided sufficient funds to fulfill that same intent in a fiscally responsible manner. Unfortunately the Congress ignored our other vital national concerns and broke the budget with this legislation.

Environmental protection has been one of my highest priorities as President. The record speaks for itself. With the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, we have established a strong new framework for developing and administering forceful programs in this problem area. I have proposed more than 25 far-reaching laws to deal with threats to the environment; most still await final action in the Congress. Pending enactment of new legislation, our enforcement agencies have cracked down on polluters under old laws seldom enforced by previous administrations.

The budget authority which I have requested for pollution control and abatement in fiscal year 1973 is more than four times the amount requested in 1969. Federal grants for local sewage treatment plant construction have increased almost tenfold, from an annual rate of \$214 million appropriated up to the time I took office, to \$2 billion in my budget for 1973. This dramatic growth in the share of Federal Government resources being devoted to the environment exceeds, many times over, the rate of increase for funds in most other major government programs.

Every environmental spending increase that I have proposed, however,

has been within the strict discipline of a responsible fiscal policy—a policy which recognizes as the highest national priority the need to protect the working men and women of America against tax increases and renewed inflation. Specifically, the water pollution control bill which I originally sent to the Congress last year was fully consistent with the concept of a balanced, full-employment budget. It would have committed \$6 billion in Federal funds over a three-year period, enough to continue and accelerate the momentum toward that high standard of cleanliness which all of us want in America's waters.

By contrast, the bill which has now come to my desk would provide for the commitment of a staggering, budget-wrecking \$24 billion. Every extra dollar which S. 2770 contemplates spending beyond the level of my budget proposals would exact a price from the consumer in the form of inflated living costs, or from the taxpayer in the form of a new Federal tax bite, or both.

Ironically, however, only a portion of the \$18 billion by which my bill was fattened on Capitol Hill would actually go to buy more pollution control than the Administration bill would have done. One backward-looking provision, for example, would provide \$750 million to reimburse State and local governments for work already completed on sewage treatment plants between 1956 and 1966. The precedent this would set for retroactive reimbursement in other matching grant programs is an invitation to fiscal chaos. Another provision would raise the Federal share of the cost of future facilities from 55 percent to 75 percent. Neither of these costly actions would, in any real sense, make our waters any cleaner: they would simply increase the burden on the Federal taxpayer.

There is a well-worn political axiom which says that any election year spending bill, no matter how ill-advised, defies veto by the President. But I say that any spending bill this year which would lead to higher prices and higher taxes defies signature by this President. I have nailed my colors to the mast on this issue; the political winds can blow where they may.

I am prepared for the possibility that my action on this bill will be overridden. The defeat of my proposal for a spending ceiling showed that many Senators and Congressmen are simply AWOL in our fight against higher taxes. And some have been lured to the wrong side of the fight by the false glitter of public works money for their districts or states. They seem to forget that it is their constituents' pockets from which the higher taxes must come as a result of their votes this week. Others, to their great credit, voted for the spending limit to try to hold taxes down. Taxpayers must be sad to learn that a majority are charge account Congressmen.

If this veto is not sustained, however, let the issue be clearly drawn. As with the spending ceiling, so with this bill, a vote to sustain the veto is a vote against a tax increase. A vote to override the veto is a vote to increase the likelihood of higher taxes.

Even if this bill is rammed into law

over the better judgment of the Executive—even if the Congress defaults its obligation to the taxpayers—I shall not default mine. Certain provisions of S. 2770 confer a measure of spending discretion and flexibility upon the President, and if forced to administer this legislation I mean to use those provisions to put the brakes on budget-wrecking expenditures as much as possible.

But the law would still exact an unfair and unnecessary price from the public. For I am convinced, on the basis of 26 years' experience with the political realities here in Washington, that the pressure for full funding under this bill would be so intense that funds approaching the maximum authorized amount could ultimately be claimed and paid out, no matter what technical controls the bill appears to grant the Executive.

I still hope, with millions of taxpayers, that at least one-third plus one of the Members in one House will be responsible enough to vote for the public interest and sustain this veto. It should be noted that doing so would by no means terminate the existing Federal water quality programs, because the Environmental Protection Agency will continue to operate those programs until the merits of a new water bill can be dealt with as a first order of business in the new Congress.

I look forward to cooperating with the next Congress on a prudent bill, to achieve ends on which we are mutually agreed, and by means which I trust will take better account than S. 2770 did of the working men and women who must ultimately pay the bill for environmental quality.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 17, 1972.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President be held at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the veto message will be held at the desk.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senate conferees kept firmly in mind the votes of this body, that no significant increases could be made above the Senate level except as required. We were able to hold those increases at \$158 million. Thus, we reduced the level for titles I and II of the foreign assistance program contained in the House-passed joint resolution by \$357 million.

Mr. President, some may argue that we need no continuing resolution at all, that the foreign aid program can keep on going. This is not true.

Mr. President, the approval of the continuing resolution for the foreign assistance program is a must if the pro-

grams under the Foreign Assistance Act are to continue.

Most every Member of the Senate, including myself, is not in favor of all of these programs. However, I doubt if there is a single Member of the Senate who does not believe that some of these programs are necessary.

I am advised by the Department of State that in the absence of a continuing resolution, it will not be possible to obligate funds for the further conduct of foreign assistance programs.

Funds in the "pipeline" will not be available for that purpose. The Comptroller General has ruled that, in the absence of a continuing resolution, AID has no authority to obligate funds, even those in the pipeline. Moreover, the pipeline consists of commitments of money for projects already underway. To take money from the pipeline for new programs and obligations, will simply disrupt ongoing programs, many of which are vital to the security of the United States.

In the absence of a continuing resolution:

First. Our economic supporting assistance programs in Southeast Asia, will be aborted, dealing a severe or fatal blow to the growth, toward South Vietnamese self-sufficiency.

Second. Continuation of relief programs in Bangladesh and in the Philippines will not be possible.

Third. No supporting assistance will be available for Israel.

Fourth. Major development programs in countries around the world, in which the United States plays a key role as a participant, will be thrown into disarray.

Fifth. AID will have no authority to retain or pay its staff of approximately 12,000 people—6,000 of whom are foreign nationals.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the other conferees on their expeditious handling of House Joint Resolution 1331, the continuing resolution.

It will be recalled that on Saturday evening we passed House Joint Resolution 1331 which included funds for the foreign assistance program totaling \$3,494,701,000. The amount of this resolution that passed the House was \$4,010,155,000. I am happy to report that since the action taken last evening, we have been able to compromise our differences with the House of Representatives and have reduced the House level to \$3,652,701,000.

The Senate conferees kept firmly in mind the views of this body that no significant increases should be made above the Senate levels passed last night. We were able to hold those increases to \$158 million. Thus we reduced the levels for titles I and II of the foreign assistance programs contained in the House-passed resolution by \$357 million.

We permitted an increase of \$50 million in worldwide development loans to provide a total of \$250 million in addition to other program availabilities. We also agreed to an increase of \$50 million in security supporting assistance funds, but required that those funds be used only to support the disaster reconstruction efforts in the Philippine Islands. We

agreed to an increase of \$50 million for military assistance to a new level of \$550.6 million. This is still \$49.4 million under the House rate. We agreed to a limited increase of \$5.5 million for American schools and hospitals and \$2.5 million for a regional naval training facility in Florida.

We also upheld the Senate's position on the continuing resolution with regard to the use of other funds from unobligated carryover, deobligations, and loan repayments.

I firmly believe that these are not significant increases. They provide only limited amounts for annual rates for operation during the interim period between now and the end of February. As compared with usual practice in such conferences I think these compromises uphold the intention of the Senate and insure that we will be able to deal effectively with the conference on the final appropriation bill when it is reintroduced in the next Congress.

I am also very pleased that the Senate conferees were able to uphold the Senate's position with regard to funds for disabled coal miners who are victims of black lung disease. This program is obviously essential to provide relief and support for these unfortunate people.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This resolution is limited to February 28, 1973?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I also thank the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) for what he said about the drug program. I am very much heartened by that. We know what a terrible problem exists with drugs. This all-pervasive problem exists throughout the country.

The chairman himself has pledged himself devotedly to making certain that this program is pursued with adequate funding.

Mr. President, the only reason I challenged the whole procedure by which we went into this matter on Saturday night was that it was hard to see what we could do about the cuts, which were sort of across the board. This proposal comes to about the same thing; but at least some effort has been made to zero in with certain items and certain activities, to see what should be done on A and what should be done on B. While I am not happy about it, I do not intend to pursue the matter further.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is one of the most unusual continuing resolutions I have ever heard about. I merely remind the Senate that we passed an appropriation for the economic foreign aid program. That program was authorized last year for 2 years.

There is no quarrel about all the economic items in the resolution. The Senate passed an appropriation bill for economic foreign aid. The House passed one. The only things that were not authorized were the military items and Bangladesh.

When the conferees went to conference, instead of going to conference on